

1 KASOWITZ BENSON TORRES LLP
2 LYN R. AGRE (State Bar No. 178218)
3 101 California Street, Suite 2300
4 San Francisco, CA 94111
5 Telephone: (415) 421-6140
6 Facsimile: (415) 398-5030
7 Email: lagre@kasowitz.com

8 Michael J. Bowe (admitted *pro hac vice*)
9 *mbowe@kasowitz.com*
10 Lauren Tabaksblat (admitted *pro hac vice*)
11 *ltabaksblat@kasowitz.com*
12 1633 Broadway, New York, NY 10019
13 (212) 506-1700 (telephone)
14 (212) 506-1800 (facsimile)

15 Counsel for Plaintiffs

16 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
17 THOMAS R. BURKE (State Bar No. 141930)
18 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 800
19 San Francisco, CA 94111
20 Telephone: (415) 276-6500
21 Facsimile: (212) 276-6599
22 Email: thomasburke@dwt.com

23 LAURA HANDMAN (appearing *pro hac vice*)
24 LISA ZYCHERMAN (appearing *pro hac vice*)
25 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
26 1919 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Suite 800
27 Washington, DC 20006
28 Telephone: (202) 973-4200
Facsimile: (202) 973-4499
Email: laurahandman@dwt.com
lisazyberman@dwt.com

LACY H. KOONCE, III (appearing *pro hac vice*)
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
1251 Avenue of the Americas, 21st Floor
New York, NY 10020
Telephone: (212) 489-8230
Facsimile: (212) 489-8340
Email: lancekoonce@dwt.com

Counsel for Defendants

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

RESOLUTE FOREST PRODUCTS, INC., *et al.*,)
Plaintiffs,) Case Number: 3:17-CV-02824-JST (KAW)
vs.)
GREENPEACE INTERNATIONAL, *et al.*,)
Defendants.)
)

Pursuant to Magistrate Judge Westmore's Standing Order, Plaintiffs Resolute Forest Products, Inc., Resolute FP US, Inc., Resolute FP Augusta, LLC, Fibrek General Partnership, Fibrek U.S., Inc., Fibrek International, Inc., and Resolute FP Canada, Inc. (collectively "Resolute" or "Plaintiffs"), and Defendants Greenpeace International, Greenpeace, Inc., Daniel Brindis, Amy Moas, and Rolf Skar (collectively the "Greenpeace Defendants"), by and through their respective counsel, hereby submit the attached joint letter regarding a discovery dispute. The parties attest that they have complied with Section 9 of the Northern District's Guidelines for Professional Conduct regarding discovery prior to filing this letter, and that, as required by ¶ 12 of this Court's Standing Order, counsel for Plaintiffs and for the Greenpeace Defendants met and conferred telephonically regarding the dispute on June 5, 2019 and, subsequently, exchanged letters and emails before reaching impasse.

1 By:

2 Date: July 9, 2019

Signed: /s/ Michael Bowe
Michael Bowe (admitted *pro hac vice*)
KASOWITZ BENSON TORRES LLP
Attorney for Plaintiffs

5 Date: July 9, 2019

6 Signed: /s/ Lacy H. Koonce, III
Lacy H. Koonce, III (admitted *pro hac vice*)
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
Attorney for Defendants Greenpeace
International, Greenpeace, Inc., Daniel
Brindis, Amy Moas and Rolf Skar

Factual Background. By Order dated January 22, 2019 (ECF No. 246), the Court dismissed Plaintiffs' RICO claims and certain state law claims, and allowed the defamation and UCL claims asserted by Resolute predicated on the Greenpeace Defendants' assertions that Resolute was harvesting in the Montagnes Blanches region of the Canadian Boreal Forest to proceed. Pursuant to the Joint Case Management Schedule & Order (ECF No. 263), fact discovery closes November 22, 2019. On March 28, 2019, Resolute served an Amended First Set of Requests for Production of Documents ("RFPs") followed by a First Set of Interrogatories ("ROGs") (collectively the "Requests") on the Greenpeace Defendants. On an April 4, 2019 phone call with Resolute's counsel, the Greenpeace Defendants objected generally to the scope of Resolute's Requests, and related definitions. Thereafter, the parties met and conferred on several occasions, and Plaintiffs agreed to stay Defendants' obligation to respond and object in writing to the Requests pending resolution of the parties' dispute. On May 24, 2019, the parties jointly submitted to the Court their dispute concerning the Greenpeace Defendants' objection to the scope of the Requests. The Court then referred all discovery disputes to Your Honor and terminated the pending discovery motion. ECF No. 265. On May 30, 2019, Your Honor ordered the parties to meet and confer again before resubmitting their discovery dispute. ECF No. 266. The parties conferred telephonically on June 5, 2019 and re-filed their letter brief on June 6, 2019 (the "Joint Letter"). ECF No. 267.

During the June 5 meet and confer, in light of the delay in obtaining a judicial resolution of the dispute over the scope of discovery, Resolute requested that the Greenpeace Defendants begin collecting and producing documents concerning the Greenpeace Defendants' assertion that Resolute was harvesting in the Montagnes Blanches over which Resolute believed there was no objection. Defendants denied this assertion and reiterated that their objection to the scope of the Requests applied to each of the pending Requests, and asserted that it would be burdensome and duplicative to collect documents prior to the resolution of the discovery dispute. In a June 18, 2019 letter, Plaintiffs again asked the Greenpeace Defendants to immediately (1) begin the production of responsive documents which were not subject to the parties' discovery dispute; and (2) serve written responses and objections to the Requests notwithstanding the parties' prior agreement because of the time that had elapsed since the dispute was raised and the approaching November 22 fact-discovery deadline. The Greenpeace Defendants responded by email dated June 19 rejecting both requests and instead noted that the parties could jointly seek to adjust the Joint Case Management Schedule, as necessary, once the Court had ruled on the parties' pending discovery dispute. Plaintiffs replied on the same day and the Greenpeace Defendant confirmed that the parties are at impasse on June 20, 2019.

Plaintiffs' Position. The federal and local rules mandate that the Greenpeace Defendants timely collect and produce responsive documents and serve written responses to document requests and interrogatories which are not the subject of a pending discovery dispute. The law is well-settled that the Greenpeace Defendants cannot use a discovery dispute to delay the production of documents which are not subject to that dispute. *See Montgomery v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 2015 WL 11233390, at *2 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 4, 2015) (requiring Home Depot to produce documents pending resolution of another discovery dispute "in order to facilitate the production of discoverable documents that had been unnecessarily delayed by Home Depo"); *Kohler v.*

1 *Chelsea San Diego Fin., LLC*, 2010 WL 4929073, at *2 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 30, 2010) (granting
 2 motion to compel supplemental responses to discovery requests notwithstanding pendency of
 3 summary judgment motion that might moot such responses).

4 The Greenpeace Defendants have admitted that they have no objection to certain discovery
 5 requests. During a meet and confer teleconference on April 4, and in the Joint Letter,
 6 Defendants confirmed that they are “more than willing to produce all [] materials and
 7 information” that were “considered and relied upon by the speaker when authoring the allegedly
 8 defamatory statements regarding the Montagnes Blanches forest region in 2016 and 2017.” ECF
 9 No. 267 at 2. In the Joint Letter, the Greenpeace Defendants also conceded that Resolute’s RFP
 10 Nos. 2-6 and 12-13 and ROG Nos. 2-3 are “nominally tailored to the issues remaining before this
 11 Court.” *Id.* at 1. In addition to these explicit representations, it is also evident that categories of
 12 requested documents exist that fall within the scope of discovery that Defendants believe is
 13 proper, and thus those documents should be produced now.

14 The Greenpeace Defendants do not dispute that the law requires a party to promptly produce
 15 documents it agreed to produce, without delay. Nor do the Greenpeace Defendants dispute that
 16 the documents at issue will be produced regardless of the outcome of the pending discovery
 17 dispute.¹ Nearly three months have passed since Resolute served its requests and yet Defendants
 18 have failed to produce a single document or respond to a single interrogatory. The Greenpeace
 19 Defendants are also refusing to produce any documents until they serve written objections.
 20 Although requested by Resolute, the Greenpeace Defendants fail to provide any authority for
 21 their untenable position that a party may withhold documents it does not object to producing
 22 until it sets forth in writing its objections to producing other documents. Moreover, the
 23 Greenpeace Defendants’ refusal to produce documents until they choose to serve written
 24 responses is all the more reason why Defendants should be ordered to serve their written
 25 responses immediately.

26 As expressed in their meet and confer correspondence, the Greenpeace Defendants would prefer
 27 not to engage in discovery and then have the parties jointly seek an adjournment of the existing
 28 deadlines. Defendants’ suggested approach is contrary to well-settled law and unacceptable to
 Plaintiffs. As set forth herein, the law requires that Defendants produce those documents to
 which they have no objection, notwithstanding the existence of a pending discovery dispute.
 Further, Plaintiffs maintain that if the Greenpeace Defendants are ordered to begin the immediate
 production of documents for which no objection has been asserted, the parties would still be in a
 position to complete all fact discovery by the current November 22 deadline, regardless of how

23 ¹ The Greenpeace Defendants are refusing to engage in a “piecemeal” collection and production of documents
 24 because they will have to “begin spending money on document production.” That is an ordinary expense of
 25 litigation. It does not come close to demonstrating an undue burden that would warrant further delay of their
 26 production of documents they concede fall within the scope of discovery and will be produced regardless of the
 27 outcome of the pending discovery dispute. As the Court is aware, basic e-discovery tools allow the Greenpeace
 28 Defendants to identify and produce such documents with little additional costs, if any, and the Greenpeace
 Defendants have not established otherwise. With an impending discovery deadline, the rolling document production
 that Plaintiffs seek is not only reasonable, it is necessary to ensure that the parties meet the discovery cut-off date.

1 the Court rules on the pending dispute. Indeed, given the nature of the defamation and UCL
 2 claims, most, if not all, of the relevant fact discovery will be obtained from Defendants.²

3 While Plaintiffs' agreed to an earlier extension of the Greenpeace Defendants' time to serve
 4 written responses,³ Plaintiffs did not enter into a "tolling agreement" with Defendants, as the
 5 Greenpeace Defendants assert. Neither party anticipated that this much time would lapse before
 6 obtaining a ruling on the discovery dispute first raised by the parties on April 4, 2019, and the
 7 change of circumstances prompted Plaintiffs' requests. More troubling, at the time Plaintiffs
 8 agreed to the courtesy extension the Greenpeace Defendants failed to advise — and Resolute did
 9 not understand — that Defendants would refuse to produce any documents until they served
 written responses. During recent meet and confers, Plaintiffs demanded that the Greenpeace
 Defendants immediately produce documents responsive to the Requests which were not subject
 to the dispute. Defendants declined to do so on the basis that they had not yet served written
 responses. Accordingly, Plaintiffs requested that the Greenpeace Defendants immediately
 provide written responses to the outstanding Requests. Defendants refused to do so.

10 Under these circumstances, the Greenpeace Defendants' refusal to provide written responses and
 11 responsive documents amounts to nothing more than a clear and transparent delay tactic. Faced
 12 with the specter of being exposed for engaging in a coordinated disinformation campaign against
 13 Resolute, the Greenpeace Defendants have refused to engage in any discovery whatsoever with
 14 the hope that *either* the Court will extend the discovery schedule and further delay Resolute's
 15 right to have its day in Court *or* the clock will run out on Plaintiffs' attempts to obtain discovery.
 Defendants' gamesmanship should not be sanctioned by the Court and Plaintiffs respectfully
 request that the Defendants be ordered to immediately serve written responses to the Requests
 and produce documents responsive to those Requests which are not subject to the pending
 discovery dispute.

16 **Defendants' Position.** The instant "dispute" over document production has been manufactured
 17 by Plaintiffs in order to yet again cause the Greenpeace Defendants to needlessly expend time
 18 and financial resources on a matter that need never have been before this Court. On April 29,
 19 **2019, the Parties confirmed in writing their prior oral agreement that Defendants would**
not be required to respond to Plaintiffs' written discovery requests until the pending
discovery dispute regarding the scope of proper discovery in this case was resolved by the
Court.⁴ Specifically, counsel for the Greenpeace Defendants wrote to counsel for Plaintiffs and

22 ² To date, Defendants have not served any discovery requests. Their strategic decision not to pursue discovery
 23 diligently is no basis to excuse their failure to comply with their own discovery obligations or warrant an extension
 of the current Court-ordered discovery deadlines.

24 ³ During an April 27, 2019 meet and confer teleconference, Defendants sought Plaintiffs consent to adjourn their
 25 time to serve written objections on the grounds that they had previously addressed each Request orally on the April
 4 teleconference. While Plaintiffs reiterated their Request that they were entitled to the objections in writing,
 Plaintiffs agreed that they would not challenge objections and responses served after the discovery dispute was
 resolved on the grounds they were untimely.

26 ⁴ In reliance on this agreement, the Greenpeace Defendants have delayed serving their own discovery requests on
 27 Plaintiffs. This was not a "strategic" decision, as Plaintiffs would have it, but a logical one: It makes little sense for
 the Greenpeace Defendants to formulate requests until the Court has addressed the scope of discovery generally.

1 asked counsel “to confirm by email that you’ve agreed to an extension of our time to provide
 2 written responses to Plaintiffs’ document requests and interrogatories; we will serve those shortly
 3 after the Court makes a ruling on the dispute being raised in the letter.” Plaintiffs’ counsel
 4 confirmed this agreement in writing.

5 The Parties then submitted a joint letter presenting that dispute over the scope of discovery to the
 6 Court, which remains pending before Your Honor at present. Yet now Plaintiffs seek to renege
 7 on this agreement, and force the Greenpeace Defendants to begin producing documents in a
 8 piecemeal fashion before the Court has clarified the scope of discovery and before the
 9 Greenpeace Defendants have served written objections.

10 Even if Plaintiffs did not anticipate a delay in resolution of the pending dispute over the scope of
 11 discovery, this does not permit Plaintiffs to ignore the Parties’ tolling agreement. Indeed, the
 12 reason the Parties entered into that agreement persists, and is apparent from the face of the
 13 Parties’ prior joint letter: Plaintiffs’ discovery requests completely disregard this Court’s Order
 14 dismissing the bulk of Plaintiffs’ claims,⁵ and improperly seek to expand the scope of discovery
 to a near-boundless extent. This has been one of Plaintiffs’ goals all along in this SLAPP suit:
 To bludgeon the Greenpeace Defendants with invasive, sprawling discovery requests in order to
 drive up costs, just as Plaintiffs tried to do on more than one occasion earlier in the case when
 they sought to pursue discovery while dispositive (and to date overwhelmingly successful)
 motions were pending. The instant “dispute” is yet one more effort to try to force the
 Greenpeace Defendants to begin spending money on document production while the scope of
 discovery remains up in the air.

15 Plaintiffs’ answer is to say that document production should commence with respect to those
 16 categories which the Greenpeace Defendants have generally indicated they would be willing to
 17 produce, once discovery is properly delineated. As has become all too common in this case,
 18 Plaintiffs use quotes out of context to argue that the Greenpeace Defendants have conceded
 19 something they have not conceded. Here, they quote the Parties’ earlier joint letter to argue that
 20 production must begin immediately because the Greenpeace Defendants agreed in that letter that
 21 they were “more than willing to produce all [] materials and information” considered and relied
 22 upon by the speakers of the purportedly defamatory statements about the Montagnes Blanches in
 23 2016 and 2017. But the language they quote contains a key qualifying phrase that Plaintiffs have
 24 deliberately omitted: ***“in response to appropriately framed requests.”*** On its face, this language
 25 indicates that the Greenpeace Defendants believed (and still believe) that Plaintiffs must reframe
 26 their requests to stay within the proper scope of discovery, something Plaintiffs have been
 27 unwilling to do, despite being on notice of Defendants’ objections since April 4, 2019.

28 ⁵ Plaintiffs’ amended complaint asserted nine separate claims against eight defendants; Plaintiffs’ defamation claim
 29 and corresponding UCL claim encompassed 296 allegedly defamatory statements. This Court’s prior Order
 30 dismissed seven of those claims, four of those defendants, and the defamation and UCL claims based on 294 of the
 31 296 statements. The Court allowed the defamation claim and the corresponding UCL claim to proceed with respect
 32 to only two statements made in 2016 and 2017 concerning the Montagnes Blanches region.

1 Further, the Greenpeace Defendants did not “admit[] that they have no objection to certain
 2 discovery requests” as Plaintiffs contend; rather, counsel for the Greenpeace Defendants merely
 3 indicated during the Parties’ meet-and-confer the types of discovery that likely were within the
 4 scope of the case, but did not suggest in any way that the Greenpeace Defendants were prepared
 5 to immediately begin producing documents. Indeed, counsel for the Greenpeace Defendants has
 6 made clear that the Greenpeace Defendants indeed have objections to both the definitions
 7 Plaintiffs has attempted to apply to all of its requests, as well as specific objections to individual
 8 requests, including those few that are more nominally tailored to scope of the case. As noted,
 9 however, the Parties explicitly agreed that Defendants would not even serve written responses to
 10 Plaintiffs’ discovery requests until the Court ruled on the scope issue, since so many of the
 11 requests could be held beyond the scope. The Greenpeace Defendants should not be forced to
 12 produce documents before they file objections.

13 Perhaps more importantly, Plaintiffs should not able to force the Greenpeace Defendants
 14 unnecessarily to expend both time and money in a myriad ways by manipulating the discovery
 15 process. As noted, this entire saga began when Plaintiffs served outrageously overbroad requests
 16 that thumb their nose at this Court’s prior decision, resulting in an entirely avoidable dispute
 17 being brought before the Court concerning the scope of discovery. Plaintiffs have now added to
 18 the Greenpeace Defendants’ litigation costs (not to mention yet again burdening the Court) by
 19 insisting on this joint discovery letter. And if Plaintiffs were to be successful in causing the
 20 Greenpeace Defendants to begin collecting and producing documents in a piecemeal fashion, this
 21 too will drive up the Greenpeace Defendants’ costs unnecessarily.⁶

22 The Greenpeace Defendants thus take the position that given the Parties’ tolling agreement, and
 23 given that the Court’s resolution of the pending dispute over scope goes to the very heart of what
 24 documents must be produced, they are not required to begin producing documents.⁷ Once the
 25 Court rules on the scope of discovery, the Greenpeace Defendants will be able to provide
 26 objections to any remaining requests that are within the scope of discovery; undertake a
 27 reasonable, comprehensive review of their documents and produce responsive material; and
 28 serve their own requests. Should the Parties need more time for discovery in light of the delay
 ultimately caused by Plaintiffs’ service of unreasonably broad requests, the Parties should ask to
 extend the discovery schedule at that time.

21 ⁶ While Plaintiffs argue that “basic e-discovery tools” allow production of documents “with little additional costs,”
 22 this assumes the Greenpeace Defendants will first collect documents consistent with Plaintiffs’ improperly broad
 23 requests, and then use automated tools to cull that data in order to produce smaller sets of documents. But it is the
 24 first step of collecting a massive set of documents that the Greenpeace Defendants believe are not relevant to the
 25 remaining claims that will impose significant additional costs, both in terms of the collection and identification
 26 process itself as well as in connection with storage of significantly larger data sets. Further, the identification and
 27 production process is not nearly as streamlined and inexpensive as Plaintiffs suggest, as in addition to automated
 28 processes, substantial human involvement is needed to ensure the correct documents are ultimately produced.

21 ⁷ This case differs significantly from *Montgomery v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, cited by Plaintiffs, which does not say
 22 what Plaintiffs argue it says. In that case, the Court had already reviewed plaintiff’s initial discovery requests and
 23 found them “overbroad and [to] extend well beyond the scope of discoverable information, particularly in light of
 24 the temporal remoteness of many of the requested documents,” and simply ordered Home Depot to produce a more
 25 limited set of documents, while the parties attempted to work out other disputes.

1
2 Respectfully submitted,
3
4

5 /s/ Michael J. Bowe
6 Michael J. Bowe
7 KASOWITZ BENSON TORRES LLP
8 1633 Broadway
9 New York, NY 10019
10 Telephone: (212) 506-1700
11 Email: mbowe@kasowitz.com

12 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

13 /s/ Lacy H. Koonce, III
14 Lacy H. Koonce, III
15 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
16 1251 Avenue of the Americas, 21st Floor
17 New York, NY 10020
18 Telephone: (212) 489-8230
19 Email: lancekoonce@dwt.com

20 *Attorneys for Defendants Greenpeace
21 International, Greenpeace, Inc., Daniel
22 Brindis, Amy Moas, and Rolf Skar*